

REMARKS

Applicants have amended the Specification on Pages 4, 10 and 26 to establish substantial correspondence between the Specification and the Claims. The support for the amendment on page 4 can be found in original independent Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, 31 and 32. The support for the amendment on page 10 can be found in original Claims 10 and 28. The support for the amendment on page 26 can be found in original Claims 3, 6, 7, 21, 24 and 25.

Applicants have canceled claims 1-37 and added new Claims 38-80. The support for the new claims can be found in the original claims and the specification. Specifically, support for Claims 42, 52 and 62 relating to non-silicone shape retention polymers can be found on page 26; support for Claims 44, 53 and 63 relating to supplemental surfactants can be found on pages 11-15; and support for antimicrobials in Claims 49, 55 and 65 can be found on page 3, lines 7-9.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Entry is believed to be proper and respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this amendment, Claims 38-80 are pending. No additional claim fee is due.

REJECTIONS

Claim Objections

The Examiner provisionally objects to Claims 1, 13, 19, 31 and 32 for the informalities "reduce the reduce the".

Applicants have canceled claims 1-37; thus, the objections are moot.

Withdraw of the objections are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC §102 over Woo et al.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 8-10, 17, 18-20, 26, 28 and 36 under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by US 5,942,217, to Woo et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Woo"). The Examiner states that Woo teaches cyclodextrin compositions for odor control. For example, Woo discloses a composition comprise cyclodextrin, polyalkyleneoxide polysiloxane, perfume, propylene glycol, preservative, and the balance water; the composition is sprayed onto fabrics and has a pH of 4. Woo also discloses another composition comprising cyclodextrin, polyalkyleneoxide polysiloxane, polyacrylic acid, perfume, propylene glycol, preservative, and the balance water; the composition is sprayed onto fabrics and has a pH of 4.5. The Examiner concludes that Woo meets all the material limitations of the claims of the present application, therefore, Woo is anticipatory.

Applicants point out that Claims 1-37 have been canceled by the present amendment; thus, the rejection is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

11

Further, Applicants submit that new claims 38-80 are not anticipated by Woo because Woo does not disclose a composition and a method of using the same, wherein the composition comprises a silicone surfactant and a silicone wrinkle control agent comprising carboxylic acid moieties, in addition to cyclodextrin, antimicrobials and other optional adjunct ingredients. Thus, new claims 38-80 are patentable over Woo.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC §102 over Thomas et al.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 13, 19 and 32 under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by US 5,057,240, to Thomas et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Thomas"). The Examiner states that Thomas teaches an odor removal composition. For example, Thomas discloses a composition consists of magnesium sulfate in water; the composition is sprayed onto nylon, which is well known in the art as protective and ballistic fiber. The Examiner concludes that Thomas meets all the material limitations of the claims of the present application, therefore, Thomas is anticipatory.

Applicants point out that Claims 1-37 have been canceled by the present amendment; thus, the rejection is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.


Further, Applicants submit that new claims 38-80 are not anticipated by Thomas because Thomas does not disclose a composition and a method of using the same, wherein the composition comprises a silicone surfactant and a silicone wrinkle control agent comprising carboxylic moieties, in addition to cyclodextrin, antimicrobials and other optional adjunct ingredients. Thus, New claims 38-80 are patentable over Thomas.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes the present amendment is fully responsive and places Claims 38-80 in condition for allowance.

In the event that issues remain prior to allowance of the noted claims, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's undersigned attorney to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully Submitted,
FOR: DuVal et al.


Caroline Wei-Berk
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 45,203
(513) 627-0352

November 24, 2003
Customer No. 27752